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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
I believe this manuscript represents a very interesting and enriching discussion on Jones fractures fixation with a robust literature research. Its importance lies in drawing attention to where we are now concerning the relationship of existing fixation methods of this type of fracture with the complications that may arise (fixation failures, nonunion and nerve injuries) and the path we are taking to improve our results. The main limitation of this study is its design. It is based on expert opinion.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
I think the reference list should be reformatted according to the journal's rules